



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/621,723 03/21/96 LEHMANN

P CASE-02138

EXAMINER

SCHWADRON, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

18M1/0913

PETER G CARROLL
MEDLEN AND CARROLL
SUITE 2200
220 MONTGOMERY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

1816

DATE MAILED:

09/13/96

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been ~~examined~~ ^{revised} ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 0 month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☐ Claims _____ are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☒ Claims 1-17 are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

15. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 1-9 are drawn to a method of treating autoimmune disease, classified in Class 424, subclass 184.1.

II. Claims 10-17 are drawn to a method of treating an infection, classified in Class 424, subclasses 204.1 and 234.1.

16. Inventions I and II are different methods of use. These inventions require different ingredients and process steps to achieve different goals. Invention I is a method of treating autoimmune disease, while invention II is a method of treating infection with a pathogenic organism. Therefore they are novel and unobvious in view of each other and are patentably distinct.

17. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II and Groups I and II have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

18. If applicant elects Group I, the following species election is required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of vaccine antigens used in the claimed invention:

- A) myelin basic protein (claim 3)
- B) proteolipid protein (claim 4)
- C) glutamic acid decarboxylase (claim 5)
- D) intra photoreceptor binding protein (claim 6)
- E) S-antigen (claim 7)
- F) renal tubular antigen (claim 8).

These antigens are distinct because they are structurally and functionally different proteins.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims

shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1,2,9 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

19. If applicant elects Group II, the following species election is required. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species in the claimed invention:

- A) Intracellular pathogen (claim 12)
- B) Extracellular pathogen (claims 13,16,17)

These pathogens are distinct because they are structurally and functionally different pathogens.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 10,11,14,15 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant

with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

20. A telephone call was made to Todd Lorenz on 9/3/96 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

21. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

22. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).


23. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group

Serial No. 08/462648
Art Unit 1816

5

180 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Papers should be faxed to Group 180 at (703) 305-7939.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Dr. Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Mondays. A message may be left on the examiners voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ms Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 180 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1816
September 11, 1996